

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Translation of (6)

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) 22. 2. 2005Applicant's or agent's file reference
4613-3PCTFOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/015617

International filing date (day/month/year)

21. 10. 2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

24. 10. 2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

MIKUNI CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/

Date of completion of this opinion

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/015617

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-5	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	3	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 4, 5	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-5	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP 8-135543 A (Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Car Engineering Co., Ltd.)
1996. 05. 28, Full text; All drawings

Document 2: JP 7-27029 A (Mitsubishi Electric Corp.)
1995. 01. 27, Full text; All drawings

Document 3: JP 9-14073 A (Denso Corp.)
1997. 01. 14, Full text; All drawings & US 5715797 A1
column 22, line 37 to column 23, line 12; Figs, 28 to 34
& CN 1140234 A & DE 19625902 A

Document 4: JP 2002-147306 A (Sanshin Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha),
2002. 05. 22, Par. Nos. [0029] to [0032]; Fig. 1

Document 5: JP 11-125162 A (Honda Motor Co., Ltd.),
1999. 05. 11, Par. Nos. [0031], [0034], [0038]; Fig. 3

Document 6: JP 10-103182 A (Suzuki Motor Corp.),
1998. 04. 21, Par. Nos. [0015] to [0017]; Fig. 1, 3

Document 7: JP 10-318060 A (Toyota Motor Corp.),
1998. 12. 02, Par. No. [0013]; Fig. 1

Document 8: JP 11-153065A (Denso Corp.)
1999.06.08, Par. Nos. [0010] to [0016]; Fig. 1,2

Document 9: JP 2000-110685 A (Toyota Motor Corp.),
2000. 04. 18, Par. Nos. [0017] to [0023]; Fig. 1

Invention concerning scope of claim 1 and 5 does not comprise inventive step by documents 1 quoted in international search report. A fuel supply system it is passed in order of a fuel pump from a fuel tank, check valve, returnless pressure regulator, and to lead to an injector is mentioned in documents 1. It is the matter which the output demanded from an engine is accepted, and a person skilled in the art can set appropriately how quantity of fuel pressure force is added by a fuel pump, and to send is set in a thing of documents 1.

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: V.2

Invention concerning scope of claim 1 does not comprise inventive step by documents 2 quoted in international search report or 3. Documents 2 or 3 a fuel supply system fuel from a fuel tank is passed in order of a fuel pump, returnless pressure regulator, and to lead to an injector is described. It is the matter which the output demanded from an engine is accepted, and a person skilled in the art can set appropriately how quantity of fuel pressure force is added by a fuel pump, and to send is set in documents 2 or 3 things.

Invention concerning scope of claim 2 does not comprise inventive step by quoted 4 - 6 in documents 1 - 3 and international search report. It is easy to adopt documents 1 - 3 fuel supply systems in a low pressure fuel pump of low pressure and a fuel supply system comprising a mind liquid separator than a the above mentioned fuel pump between documents 4 - 6 fuel tanks and fuel pumps for a person skilled in the art.

Invention concerning scope of claim 4 does not comprise inventive step by quoted documents 7 - 9 in documents 1 - 3 and international search report. It is easy to adopt documents 7 - 9 positive displacement compressor pumps as documents 1 - 3 a fuel pump of three fuel supply systems for a person skilled in the art.

Invention concerning scope of claim 3 is not mentioned in documents of the gap that wants to be quoted in international search report either so that it is not the person who is self-evident for a person skilled in the art.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/015617

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Invention concerning scope of claim 5 is indistinct. In other words it is described with "a the above mentioned mind liquid separator" in invention concerning scope of claim 5, it becomes inarticulate which rehabilitation the "the above mentioned mind liquid separator" supports, because in invention concerning scope of claim 5, "a mind liquid separator" is not described before description of the "the above mentioned mind liquid separator", in addition, because "a mind liquid separator" is not mentioned in invention concerning scope of claim 1 that invention concerning scope of claim 5 quotes either,